

Appl. No. 10/708,944
Amdt. dated November 08, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 11, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112:

The present application discloses an aseismatic device that can provide an anti-shock effect to protect an OHT system from being damaged when an unexpected quake e.g. earthquake occurs. In the Office action, the Examiner stated that the recitation "the aseismatic device can decide a horizontal aseismatic value by adjusting quantities of the spring" has not been disclosed in such a way as to enable an ordinary skill in the art to duplicate the claimed invention. However, the applicant disagrees with this rejection and hereby explains as follows.

As well known, an earthquake may generate a vertical quake and a horizontal quake. The earthquake may cause damages to the OHT system, and therefore the present application proposes an aseismatic device to prevent damages from the horizontal quake. In the specification in paragraphs [0022] – [0024] and in Fig.4 for instance, the mechanism of the spring pin 66 has been clearly disclosed. The spring pin 66 includes at least a spring 70 and a positioning ball 72 fixed in a cavity by the elastic force of the spring 70 in normal condition so that the first platform 60 and the second platform 64 are not moved relatively. As long as an earthquake occurs, the positioning ball 72 is horizontally shifted away from the cavity 68 so that the seismic energy is absorbed. Consequently, the OHT system 50 and the clean rooms (not shown) will not be damaged by the seismic energy.

The horizontal aseismatic value is decided according to the force that the OHT system 50 can bear during an earthquake (e.g. 40 Kg). It would be a common sense that increasing the quantities of the springs 70 can adjust

Appl. No. 10/708,944
Amdt. dated November 08, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 11, 2005

the horizontal aseismatic value according to Hooke's law. Therefore, the force that the spring 70 acts upon the positioning ball 72 is proportional to the quantities of the springs 70. The applicant believes that the entire specification of the present application has been fully disclosed in such a 5 way as to enable an ordinary skill in the art to duplicate the claimed invention. Reconsideration of claims 1-19 is therefore politely requested.

2. Rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112:

The present application discloses an aseismatic device that can provide 10 an anti-shock effect to protect an OHT system from being damaged when unexpected quake e.g. earthquake occurs. In the Office action, the Examiner stated that in claims 1 and 14 the phrase "wherein the spring decides a horizontal aseismatic value by adjusting quantities of the spring" is confusing as it is unclear how can the spring adjust quantities of the 15 spring. The applicant believes that the Examiner misunderstands this recitation in claims 1 and 14, and hereby explains as follows.

In claims 1 and 14, the exact recitation is "wherein the spring pin decides a horizontal aseismatic value by adjusting quantities of the spring, 20 and as long as a horizontal force that acts on the aseismatic device is greater than the horizontal aseismatic value, the positioning ball shifts away from the cavity for cushioning the horizontal force", rather than "wherein the spring decides a horizontal aseismatic value by adjusting quantities of the spring". Since the spring pin has at least a spring disposed 25 therein, it would be clear that adjusting the quantities of the spring could decide a horizontal aseismatic value of the aseismatic device. Therefore, the applicant believes that claims 1-19 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Appl. No. 10/708,944
Amdt. dated November 09, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 11, 2005

Reconsideration of claims 1-19 is politely requested.

3. Rejections of claims 1 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsai (US 2003/0167707):

5 Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "the first platform comprises a plurality of second supporting rods for suspending and supporting a heavy object" has been added to claim 1. This limitation finds support in original claim 7 for instance, and no new matter is entered.

10

The Examiner has acknowledged that this limitation would be allowed if rewritten in independent form in the Office action. Thus, the amended claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 11-12 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 15 1 and 11-12 is therefore respectfully requested.

4. Rejections of claims 2-6, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai (US 2003/0167707) in view of Nishibe et al. (JP 06234495A):

20 Claims 2-6, 9 and 13 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 2-6, 9 and 13 is therefore politely requested.

5. Allowable subject matter:

25 Claim 7 has been cancelled. Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 8 is therefore politely requested.

Appl. No. 10/708,944
Amdt. dated November 08, 2005
Reply to Office action of August 11, 2005

Arguments have been made to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C 112. Claims 14-19 should be allowed if the rejection under 35 U.S.C 112 is overcome. Reconsideration of claims 14-19 is therefore politely requested.

- 5 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

10

Winston Hsu

Date: Nov. 08, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

- 15 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
20 is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 10 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)